# U.S. Department of Education 2011 - Blue Ribbon Schools Program

A Public School

| School Type (Public Schools):                                     |                           | <b>~</b>                       |                 |                        |                   |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| (Check all that apply, if any)                                    | Charter                   | Title 1                        | Magnet          | Choice                 |                   |
| Name of Principal: <u>Dr. Andre</u>                               | w Heughins                | Ed.D.                          |                 |                        |                   |
| Official School Name: Ethan                                       | B. Allen El               | ementary School                | <u>l</u>        |                        |                   |
| · ·   | 16200 Bush<br>Fountain Va | nard Street<br>alley, CA 92708 | <u>-1505</u>    |                        |                   |
| County: Orange  | State School              | ol Code Number:                | 3066522602      | <u>28369</u>           |                   |
| Telephone: (714) 663-6228   | E-mail: <u>ah</u>         | eughins@ggusd                  | .us             |                        |                   |
| Fax: (714) 663-6201   | Web URL:                  | http://www.ggu                 | ısd.k12.ca.us/  | allen/                 |                   |
| I have reviewed the information - Eligibility Certification), and |                           |                                |                 |                        |                   |
|   |                           |                                | ·               | Date                   |                   |
| (Principal's Signature)   |                           |                                |                 |                        |                   |
| Name of Superintendent*: <u>Dr.</u>                               | Laura Schw                | valm PhD Supe                  | erintendent e-r | nail: <u>lschwalm@</u> | ggusd.us          |
| District Name: Garden Grove                                       | Unified Sch               | ool District Dis               | trict Phone: (7 | 714) 663-6000          |                   |
| I have reviewed the information - Eligibility Certification), and |                           |                                |                 |                        | on page 2 (Part I |
|   |                           |                                |                 | Date                   |                   |
| (Superintendent's Signature)                                      |                           |                                |                 |                        |                   |
| Name of School Board Preside                                      | ent/Chairper              | son: <u>Mr. Lan Ng</u>         | <u>uyen</u>     |                        |                   |
| I have reviewed the information - Eligibility Certification), and |                           |                                |                 |                        | on page 2 (Part I |
|   |                           |                                |                 | Date                   |                   |
| (School Board President's/Cha                                     | airperson's S             | Signature)                     |                 |                        |                   |

The original signed cover sheet only should be converted to a PDF file and emailed to Aba Kumi, Blue Ribbon Schools Project Manager (aba.kumi@ed.gov) or mailed by expedited mail or a courier mail service (such as Express Mail, FedEx or UPS) to Aba Kumi, Director, Blue Ribbon Schools Program, Office of Communications and Outreach, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Room 5E103, Washington, DC 20202-8173.

<sup>\*</sup>Private Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

- 1. The school has some configuration that includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
- 2. The school has made adequate yearly progress each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years.
- 3. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement in the 2010-2011 school year. AYP must be certified by the state and all appeals resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
- 4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take the course.
- 5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2005.
- 6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 or 2010.
- 7. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
- 8. OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
- 9. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
- 10. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

### All data are the most recent year available.

### DISTRICT

- 1. Number of schools in the district: 47 Elementary schools (per district designation) 10 Middle/Junior high schools 9 High schools 0 K-12 schools 66 Total schools in district 2. District per-pupil expenditure: 8686

**SCHOOL** (To be completed by all schools)

- 3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

  Suburban with characteristics typical of an urban area urban area
- 4. Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school:
- 5. Number of students as of October 1, 2010 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

| Grade | # of Males                | # of Females | Grade Total |  |    | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |
|-------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------|--|----|------------|--------------|-------------|
| PreK  | 0                         | 0            | 0           |  | 6  | 80         | 72           | 152         |
| K     | 27                        | 23           | 50          |  | 7  | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 1     | 35                        | 34           | 69          |  | 8  | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 2     | 44                        | 38           | 82          |  | 9  | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 3     | 56                        | 41           | 97          |  | 10 | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 4     | 78                        | 72           | 150         |  | 11 | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 5     | 64                        | 66           | 130         |  | 12 | 0          | 0            | 0           |
|       | Total in Applying School: |              |             |  |    |            |              | 730         |

| 6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school: | 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native          |
|---|---|
|   | 79 % Asian                                    |
|   | 0 % Black or African American                 |
|   | 11 % Hispanic or Latino                       |
|   | 0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander |
|   | 10 % White                                    |
|   | 0 % Two or more races                         |
|   | 100 % Total                                   |
|   |   |

Only the seven standard categories should be used in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2009-2010 school year: 10% This rate is calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.

| (1) | Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1, 2009 until the end of the school year.   | 58   |
|-----|---|------|
| (2) | Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2009 until the end of the school year. | 5    |
| (3) | Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].  | 63   |
| (4) | Total number of students in the school as of October 1, 2009  | 650  |
| (5) | Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).                                       | 0.10 |
| (6) | Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.  | 10   |

| 8. Percent limited English proficient students in the school:      | 27% |
|--|-----|
| Total number of limited English proficient students in the school: | 200 |
| Number of languages represented, not including English:            | 12  |
| Specify languages:   |     |

Arabic, Cantonese, Farsi, Gujarati, Khmer, Korean, Lao, Mandarin, Spanish, Turkish, Urdu, and Vietnamese

|  | C |  |
|--|---|--|
|  |   |  |
|  |   |  |
|  |   |  |

| 9. | Percent of | students | eligible | for free | /reduced- | priced | meals: |
|----|------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|--------|--------|
|    |            |          |          |          |           |        |        |

35%

Total number of students who qualify:

261

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-priced school meals program, supply an accurate estimate and explain how the school calculated this estimate.

10. Percent of students receiving special education services:

5%

Total number of students served:

34

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

| 4 Autism                | Orthopedic Impairment                   |
|-------------------------|---|
| 0 Deafness              | 4 Other Health Impaired                 |
| 0 Deaf-Blindness        | 4 Specific Learning Disability          |
| 0 Emotional Disturbance | 18 Speech or Language Impairment        |
| 0 Hearing Impairment    | Traumatic Brain Injury                  |
| 1 Mental Retardation    | 0 Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| 3 Multiple Disabilities | 0 Developmentally Delayed               |

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

### Number of Staff

|                                       | <u>Full-Time</u> | <u>Part-Time</u> |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Administrator(s)                      | 1                | 0                |
| Classroom teachers                    | 25               | 0                |
| Special resource teachers/specialists | 1                | 0                |
| Paraprofessionals                     | 0                | 4                |
| Support staff                         | 3                | 9                |
| Total number                          | 30               | 13               |
|                                       |                  |                  |

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1:

28:1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Only high schools need to supply graduation rates. Briefly explain in the Notes section any student or teacher attendance rates under 95% and teacher turnover rates over 12% and fluctuations in graduation rates.

|                             | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Daily student attendance    | 98%       | 98%       | 98%       | 98%       | 98%       |
| Daily teacher attendance    | 94%       | 93%       | 93%       | 94%       | 94%       |
| Teacher turnover rate       | 0%        | 4%        | 4%        | 4%        | 0%        |
| High school graduation rate | 0%        | 0%        | 0%        | 0%        | 0%        |

If these data are not available, explain and provide reasonable estimates.

Daily teacher attendance rates are under 95% due to maternity leave.

14. For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools): Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2010 are doing as of Fall 2010.

| Graduating class size:                     | 0             |
|--|---------------|
| Enrolled in a 4-year college or university | 0%            |
| Enrolled in a community college            | 0%            |
| Enrolled in vocational training            | $\overline{}$ |
| Found employment                           | 0%            |
| Military service                           | 0%            |
| Other                                      | $\overline{}$ |
| Total                                      | 0%            |

Ethan Allen Elementary is one 66 schools in the Garden Grove Unified School District and serves grade K-6 from the cities of Garden Grove, Fountain Valley, Santa Ana, and Westminster, located in Orange County, California. The diverse ethnic population at Allen is comprised of the following: 78.6% Asian American, 0.4% Filipino-American, 10.7% Hispanic, 0.1% Pacific Islander, and 9.9% White and 0.3% Other. Of these students, 27% are English Learners. 35.3% of the students receive free or reduced price meals. Allen is a Targeted Title I school with over 740 students, including 13 Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) classrooms and a Special Education program for full inclusion students.

The professional learning environment of Allen Elementary consists of a dedicated staff, outstanding students and active parents. Our mission is to foster teamwork, strong work ethics, and dedication towards excellence with the vision that all students will meet or exceed grade level standards. It is a place where all students have numerous opportunities to reach their potential, specifically the Proficient or Advanced academic level according to the California State Standards. In order to meet these rigorous standards, Allen Elementary has implemented research-based programs that ensure appropriate curriculum and instruction is provided to all students. Our standards-based program utilizes assessments on an ongoing basis to provide accountability for staff, teachers, and students.

Allen Elementary strives to meet and exceed our district goals and state goals. District Goal One states that students will meet grade-level standards within five years in core academic subjects as measured by proficiency on the California Standards Tests (CST) in English language arts, writing, mathematics, and science. Based on the diversity in our district and the expectation that the needs of our English language learners will be met, District Goal Two states that within four years our English language learners will meet the English Proficient level as measured by the California English Language Development Test (CELDT). These goals provide the focus for our vision that all students master or exceed grade-level standards. Our success is reflected in the results of the CST. The California Academic Performance Index (API) has the goal of all schools achieving a score of 800 out of 1000 possible. In 2010, Allen received a score of 971. Similar success has been achieved in Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) with 90% of students meeting proficiency in English Language Arts (ELA) and 96% meeting proficiency in mathematics. This success was acknowledged during 2010 with the awarding of *Distinguished School* status by the State of California.

The Allen Elementary school staff feels strongly that an important part of our role in the community is to support our parents as fully as possible. To that end we, are constantly looking to share with families ways that they can support their student's learning and improve student achievement. We offer a variety of parent training sessions, including GATE parent meetings, which provide special support and strategies for parents of GATE students, and "Ten Commandments Training" to provide parents with strategies and the knowledge needed for their children to attend a university. Most recently we have qualified staff in the "Forty Developmental Assets," a series of trainings designed to help parents learn the strategies and skills needed by twenty-first century students to become successful contributing members of society. We have also offered Saturday Parent Workshops called Saturday Seminars, which provide parents with an opportunity to learn skills and strategies they can employ at home to help their students to be successful. These Saturday Seminars reach our diverse cultures at Allen by pairing up the teacher presenter with parents speaking Vietnamese, Spanish, and English so that as many families as possible can attend these meetings and be supported in their home language. Allen's GATE program offers a Bridge class that helps transition students and parents into the GATE program. This class ensures that parents gain valuable insight into the GATE program to familiarize them with the curriculum and models of instruction.

As a school community, endorsing an environment centralized around academics and scholarly behavior is of high priority. Yet, we do not fail to acknowledge that our students are children and that they need opportunities to celebrate their childhood. At Allen, we offer a number of educational activities that help

our students grow socially and emotionally. Our goal is to aid our students in maintaining a healthy balance between academics, social relationships, and emotional support. These activities include, our annual TET festival to celebrate the Asian New Year, sporting events, a talent show, the dance festival, and our version of the Pageant of the Masters, called Great Moments, where students re-enact famous works of art.

Finally, the Allen community strongly stresses the importance of good citizenship, maintaining a high expectation of appropriate behavior and supporting our students emotionally. Every single member of our staff, which includes noon duty supervisors, cafeteria workers, school custodians, teachers, principal, and school volunteers, knows the importance for recognizing all that is positive and possible in our students. Thus, we consider every single member of our school and community as an essential part of every child's life. At Allen Elementary, you will find the highest standards in student safety, support, and success.

#### 1. Assessment Results:

The measure of academic achievement for Allen students is the California Standardized Test (CST). The CST exam, given each spring, is aligned with the California Content Standards and is given to grades two through six in Mathematics and English Language Arts (ELA). CST student performance levels are divided into five quintiles: Far Below Basic, Below Basic, Proficient, and Advanced Proficient. In alignment with the State of California and Goal One of the Garden Grove Unified School District, Allen Elementary continually strives to ensure all students achieve and maintain Proficient and Advanced levels in Mathematics and ELA.

The Academic Yearly Progress (AYP) score is a measure of students scoring Proficient or Advanced in Mathematics and ELA on the CST each year. Allen students have shown continued success in working towards meeting the goal of all students achieving proficiency by 2014. AYP in ELA has grown from 85% in 2006 to 90% in 2010. Mathematics showed an increase in AYP from 92% in 2006 to 96% in 2010. Documentation of AYP growth is shown in the data below and can be viewed at http://dq.cde.ca.gov/Dataquest.

In addition to the AYP, California schools are also rated through an Academic Performance Index (API) score. The California Department of Education describes the API as a "single number, ranging from a low of 200 to a high of 1000 that reflects a school's, an LEA's, or a subgroup's performance level, based on the results of statewide testing. Its purpose is to measure the academic performance and growth of schools." In the past six years, Allen Elementary School's (California) Academic Performance Index (API) has risen from an API score of 898 in 2004, to a current score of 971 in 2010.

The following data reflects the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced in ELA: 85% in 2006, 85% in 2007, 88% in 2008, 91% in 2009 and 90% in 2010. The percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced in Mathematics was 92% in 2006 and 2007, 93% in 2008 and 2009, and growing to 96% in 2010.

Our test data in 2010 reflects the scores of six sub-groups. These include: Asian (91 ELA, 98 Mathematics), Hispanic (83 ELA, 97 Mathematics), White (84 ELA, 81 Mathematics), Socio-Economically Disadvantaged (SED) (90 ELA, 97 Mathematics), English Learners (EL) (84 ELA, 94 Mathematics), and Students with Disabilities (74 ELA, 88 Mathematics). All sub-groups scored significantly above the AYP targets for 2010 of 58% in Mathematics and 56.8% in ELA. However, the data above does show an achievement gap in the area of ELA for the Students with Disabilities subgroup, and in the area of Mathematics for the White sub-group with discrepancies of 15.3% and 15.1% respectively. To address the achievement gap, Allen teachers use differentiated instruction as the first level of intervention, including small group instruction and re-teaching strategies. In addition, Students with Disabilities receive assistance from our Resource and Speech specialists. Tier two intervention strategies comprise the Early Reading Intervention program (ERI), The Voyager reading program, and the Language! Program. Allen teachers also run intensive before and after-school intervention programs for students struggling in both Mathematics and ELA.

The history of increasing proficiency on state assessments at Allen since the introduction of the No Child Left Behind legislation (NCLB) and standards based instruction illustrates the continually growing skill of teachers and staff in using data to address the needs of individual students. It also reflects the belief of the staff that Allen's mission is to find the voice of the child among the broad range of assessment results, thus informing teachers on how to improve the quality of instruction in order to continuously move our target students and proficiency band jumpers to the next level.

### 2. Using Assessment Results:

At Allen Elementary, the concept of data analysis has changed over time from being a teacher-centered process to a student-centered one. Six years ago, assessments were an end goal to our instruction; now, the use of assessments is part of a cyclical process wherein the data is used to determine purposeful instruction. As this shift in thinking occurred, it became clear that to meet the needs of our students, each activity in all disciplines must be meaningful and tailored to each child. The practice of data analysis allowed for changes in perspective on the purpose of data which, in turn, caused changes in how we instruct and how students understand their own learning. As one Allen teacher observed, "We gave students ownership of their learning by having them analyze their data. From that, the student and teacher set student academic goals and students took responsibility for their own education throughout the entire school year."

Allen Elementary uses data throughout the year to establish goals for individual students, by grade level, and for the school as a whole. We begin with the CST testing information we receive in the summer. CST- ELA and CST- Math results are analyzed by the staff using customized reports and graphs. Data is compared with the performance and growth of the previous years. Patterns, trends, strengths and challenges are all noted. The achievement is used to measure how we are doing compared to the vision: Are all students meeting or exceeding grade level standards?

One of the key components to Allen's assessment practices is Data Director, a web-based student assessment system. All state assessments including CST and CELDT are available to all teachers. The district based formative and summative assessments such as Math and Language Arts benchmarks, fall and spring writing prompts, Comprehensive Literacy Assessments and Houghton Mifflin (the GGUSD-adopted ELA curriculum) Summative Tests are all scored and entered into the data system. This allows teachers to access multiple data, reports, and student information for each of their students. Data Director also allows teachers to monitor and evaluate student achievement and plays a crucial role in planning instruction, intervention, and staff development needs. Students identified as needing academic support through these assessments are provided individualized and small group instruction through differentiation, re-teaching activities and extra support materials provided by the base program. Not only can teachers view and analyze the data, but Allen teachers often give the information to the students to help look for trends and patterns themselves and plan strategies for them accordingly.

Students take district benchmark assessments in mathematics and language arts each trimester. The results of these benchmarks are made available on Data Director. This enables the teacher to disaggregate the results in a multitude of ways. For example a teacher may analyze how students performed on a specific standard. A teacher may then determine specific interventions to help students meet this standard in the future. Furthermore, students analyze benchmark assessments and set clear and focused goals for themselves.

## 3. Communicating Assessment Results:

The diverse population of Allen Elementary makes communicating with our families in a variety of ways essential. Written information is translated into different languages to clearly communicate with families. This information includes the Report Cards that can be printed in the student's home language, goal-setting forms, grade-level specific handbooks with listed grade-level standards, and informational fliers. Furthermore, teachers communicate with parents via email, websites, notes, and phone calls to keep parents aware of student progress. Assistance is provided by onsite Spanish and Vietnamese speaking Community Liaisons. Our school website and our School Report Card, available online through the Allen webpage and our district's webpage, provide parents and the community at large with information that shares our state standards and the progress Allen students are making towards meeting these standards as a school community.

During Back to School Night, parents are taught how to read and understand the California State Standards, as well as how they may analyze data and reports, such as their child's state testing results and

other data that might come throughout the year. In addition, parents and students participate in Goal-Setting Conferences, which provides an opportunity to reflect on the student's progress during the first trimester and make goals as a team to help students become successful.

Student-Led Conferences is another key way we communicate to students and parents at Allen Elementary. Throughout the school year, the teachers work to prepare the students for this conference. The students must gather "evidence" that they have mastered each standard by selecting a piece of work that demonstrates mastery of a specific standard. During the spring conference, the students must explain to their parents which standards they have been learning and use specific student work to demonstrate mastery of the standard. Students' progress is also shared three times each year using the trimester report cards.

At Allen Elementary, it is essential that parents receive support in all aspects of their lives and have access to resources that address their child's physical, social, emotional, and intellectual needs. For example, with our GATE population, we recognize that the parents also might be in need of learning how to effectively work and support their gifted child at home. GATE parent training nights are held throughout the year to help support parents with teaching the GATE learning tools and dealing with the vast emotional and social characteristics of a gifted child. These trainings also assist parents in comprehending the rigorous standards that are a part of the child's education and provide assistance at home. Thus, parents can provide the greatest emotional and academic support for their child.

### 4. Sharing Lessons Learned:

All GGUSD teachers and administrators have an open-door policy with which we share our successes and best practices. GGUSD has formed a Leadership Academy, which consists of cohorts of teachers and administrators from elementary schools who meet three times during the school year. The purpose of these grade-level representatives and administrators is to focus on staff development, work to align instruction practice with state standards, and share best practices. Leadership Academy also works to help each school develop, organize, and implement their Single Plan for Student Achievement. After each Leadership Academy meeting, all information shared is disseminated to their peers; the representatives along with the principal help facilitate implementation of new or improved practices and provide any support needed.

Specifically, Allen Elementary has been at the forefront of collaborating with not only schools in our district but with schools in other districts in Southern California. Visitors, which include classroom teachers, administrators, and Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSA), have had numerous walkthroughs at our school to observe our use of GATE strategies, Thinking Maps, Universal Access time, data analysis, as well as our lessons on differentiation to meet the needs of all students from ELL's to advanced learners in all subjects. These Learning Walks allow visitors to observe, analyze, and help improve specific teaching practices at their school site, such as backward planning with the use of data, use of flexible grouping in ELA, and extending student learning beyond the base curriculum.

Many of our teachers have also presented at various conferences and during GGUSD trainings. For example, GATE teachers have participated in the Orange County Council GATE conference. OCC GATE is a consortium that facilitates a network a coordinators, teachers, and representatives in order to help strengthen GATE programs. At these yearly conferences, our GATE teachers have presented on many topics including the use of technology and classic art in the classroom and compacting students in Math. During GGUSD training "Super Weeks," before the start of every school year, Allen teachers often act as presenters to share successful practices. Most recently, Allen 5<sup>th</sup> grade teachers presented an instructional model on teaching 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade Science standards in preparation for the 5<sup>th</sup> grade Science CST.

### 1. Curriculum:

At Allen Elementary, our goal is to secure a positive learning environment that focuses on student achievement and promotes life-long learners. Our teachers are committed to delivering high-quality instruction using research-based strategies to meet the diverse needs of our students.

Garden Grove Unified School District has adopted Houghton Mifflin, a balanced, comprehensive language arts program aligned with the California State Standards and Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools. The scope and sequence of the program creates a coherent structure for teaching reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Assessment tools allow teachers to evaluate student knowledge and plan and modify instruction to help all students meet or exceed standards. The Houghton Mifflin program provides planning for differentiation in order to maximize the learning of all students. A wide variety of instructional strategies and lessons are presented to differentiate and optimize learning opportunities for all students, including English learners, students with special learning needs, and advanced students. Through faithful implementation of the Houghton Mifflin program, students in grades K-6 receive systematic instruction and reinforcement of vital skills and strategies in order to demonstrate mastery. Students in the intensive group, who are seriously at risk, receive intense intervention and instruction from the Language! Program, a state adopted intervention program focusing on basic reading skills.

The Harcourt math program used at Allen Elementary is comprehensive and aligned with the California State Standards. It builds conceptual understanding, develops logical reasoning, and promotes problem solving at all grade levels. The program includes opportunities to practice, re-teach, and challenge. The instructional program includes manipulatives, calculators, clocks, money, and other concrete materials, to provide multiple modalities for all learners to investigate the principles of mathematics.

The district has adopted the Scott Foresman California history social science curriculum for grades kindergarten – 5th grade and Harcourt Reflections California series for grade 6. At Allen, teachers utilize these programs to develop a deep and thoughtful understanding of the world in which we live. All grades emphasize the exploration and analysis of critical events, people, and places.

GGUSD has adopted the inquiry-based Macmillan/McGraw-Hill science curriculum, a standard-based program. It reflects a balanced, comprehensive approach that includes the teaching of investigation and experimentation skills. The goal of the science program is to utilize multi-sensory instructional strategies and provide opportunities for students to master the California content standards. One of the excellent components in the program is the various resources and lab materials it provides to enable students the opportunity for hands-on experiments in the classroom.

Visual and performing arts are also an integral part of the curriculum at Allen Elementary. The Garden Grove Unified School District provides students in grades K- 3 vocal instruction from a qualified, credentialed music teacher every other week. Students in grades 4-6 receive instruction every week with the opportunity to participate in the school chorus. Instrumental music is offered to students in grades 4-6 and is taught by a qualified, credentialed teacher. The Visual performing arts are celebrated at Allen through Art Master's program where students learn about a particular artist and produce an art piece in the style of that artist. Teachers also incorporate art lessons across all disciplines including language arts, science, social studies and math.

Positive health habits and practices are strongly advocated at Allen Elementary. It begins with a strong belief that a healthy body promotes a healthy and strong mind. To support this belief, The Positive Action program in grades K-5 and Life Skills in grade 6 are utilized as part of a comprehensive health education program that includes instruction in good eating habits, hygiene practices, drug-use prevention, and exercise. School events, such as the Allen Dance Festival and Red Ribbon Week also support this belief.

The Dance Festival allows every class to learn a cultural dance and at the same time promotes dancing as a form of physical exercise. Red Ribbon Week promotes a commitment to a healthy life style in a weeklong celebration. Activities include an art contest, wearing red to show solidarity against drugs, tobacco, and alcohol, a family red ribbon is designed and posted on the grounds, and a giant poster is displayed with student, staff, and parent pledges. Students' health is further monitored through regular vision, hearing, and health screening. The school health aide screens each student for immunizations, physicals, and attendance.

### 2. Reading/English:

Garden Grove Unified School District is currently utilizing *Houghton Mifflin* as its instructional program for reading/language arts. The district utilizes the process of a consult represented by administrators, teachers, and curriculum specialists to select instructional materials and programs. Part of the process involves piloting and evaluating various curricula considered for adoption. The school community also participates in the development and implementation of our literacy plan conducting pilot tests and attending informational meetings. The process allows all stakeholders multiple opportunities to examine the curricula's effectiveness and reliability to meet the instructional needs of all students, enabling them to meet or exceed the standards.

Houghton Mifflin is a comprehensive, balanced language arts program that provides explicit, systematic instruction and diagnostic support in phonemic awareness, phonics and decoding, word attack skills, spelling, vocabulary, comprehension skills, writing skills and strategies, and listening and speaking skills and strategies. Prerequisite skills are taught and future instruction builds on those skills to develop depth and complexity. Students acquire foundational reading skills in grades K-3 Grades 4-6 focus on using text to learn. Assessment opportunities are embedded throughout the program to assess students' knowledge of skills and strategies.

Faithful implementation of the *Houghton Mifflin* program is the basis for Language Arts instruction in all Garden Grove Elementary Schools. Planning is based on five day pacing guides for Kindergarten and first grade, and seven day pacing plans for grades 2 - 6. Daily lessons include a reading block, word work, and writing. In addition, an approximately thirty minute Universal Access time takes place within the Language Arts period. During Universal Access time, students receive extra practice in areas of need identified from assessments and teacher observations. Students work individually on differentiated assignments, while the teacher provides small group instruction. The classroom environment is also used as an instructional tool. Each classroom teacher constructs a Reading Theme board consisting of the state standards for the theme, story genres, literature selections, reading strategies to be emphasized, grammar skills, and key vocabulary. The boards are used as an integral part of instruction, with students taught how to access the information they contain for use as a reference while working independently.

Houghton Mifflin also presents materials constructed to meet the needs of those who have learning deficiencies, a limited language background, and advanced students. Differentiation allows teachers to utilize a repertoire of successful instructional strategies and lessons that emphasize different learning modalities and specific learning needs. Students that are reading more than two years below grade level receive instruction from the Language! Program, a state adopted program for intensive, struggling learners.

### 3. Mathematics:

Garden Grove uses the *Harcourt* math program as the basis for an innovative mathematics instructional model the district calls, *Project G*. In the *Project G* instructional model, teachers explicitly and metacongnitively model the precise procedures required to solve problems. These "think-alouds" allow students to get inside the head of the teacher. Their only responsibility is to watch and listen. Next, teachers use a gradual release of responsibility model to ensure that students are progressing toward mastery before they are released to guided and independent practice. No students are left behind. Frequent, built-in checks for understanding inform teacher practice. Every student is personally

accountable during the multiple active participation moments in the *Project G* lesson design. This ensures students are engaged throughout the lesson.

During the guided practice phase, students work independently and then in a group to compare answers. A student from each group is then chosen to present a problem to the class. Problems are chosen selectively; quality trumps quantity. These peer-to-peer opportunities to learn are a daily feature of lessons that create an environment that lowers the affective barriers to math.

Finally, if a teacher determines that the majority of the class is capable of working independently, those students for whom checks for understanding have revealed a lack of skill meet with the teacher in a small group setting for more structured practice. These built-in daily remedial settings provide students with the support they need. Furthermore, the data-driven model used by teachers to guide instruction throughout the year ensures that future lessons revisit and review key concepts with which many students have experienced difficulty.

Project G addresses the needs of our English learners, gifted students, and students with special needs throughout the instructional model. Students who verbalize their thoughts and describe their thinking process are not just learning concepts but are internalizing the essential standards, thus storing this newly acquired knowledge in their long-term memory. Students uniquely have many opportunities to communicate their learning. Academic language is constantly used by the students and teachers. Key vocabulary is explicitly taught by the teacher, usually using symbolic representations. Teachers model the appropriate use of academic vocabulary during think-alouds, and students are expected and held accountable to use academic vocabulary during their many opportunities to orally contribute. The 2009-10 school year was the first year of implementation of the *Project G* instructional model at Allen, during which the percentage of proficient and advanced students grew to 95.8% and the percent of far below basic and below basic students decreased to 1.27%.

### 4. Additional Curriculum Area:

In Science, Allen teachers utilize a hands-on approach that includes engaging activities in life, earth, and physical sciences as well as investigation and experimentation with the goal of developing inquiry skills. The science program at Allen is based on the California Science standards and all lessons begin with the developing the students' command of the academic language of these content standards. Teachers use multiple instructional strategies including lab experiments using materials and resources provided by the *MacMillan/McGraw* science program. Teachers also create explorative projects such as conducting egg drop experiments with student-made contraptions to test the physics of gravity and acceleration on an object. Furthermore, GATE classrooms include the GATE strategy, "Thinking Like a Disciplinarian," which allows students to investigate the sciences through the point of view of a disciplinarian like a botanist, chemist, or astronomer, to name a few. This strategy promotes the use of technology so students develop computer literacy and the skill of using various information resources. Allen teachers approach science with a constructivist perspective so all students, from our English Language Learner's (ELL) to advanced learners, may achieve a true understanding of science concepts.

Another successful strategy at Allen is the preparation of all 5<sup>th</sup> grade students for the Science CST. Over the past few years, the Allen 5<sup>th</sup> grade teachers have developed an instructional model called the Allen Science Days. The objective is to provide explorative, interactive, and inquiry-based review of the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade science standards. The students are put into small groups and spend two entire days rotating to different classrooms and teachers; this is modeled after a high school period schedule. Each teacher reviews an assigned science standard in student-centered activities integrating technology, Thinking Maps, centers, games, manipulatives, and experiments. As a result of this instructional model, the Allen students have excelled on the Science CST. In 2010, 94% of the students scored either proficient or advanced on the test, by far exceeding the 55% average score of other 5<sup>th</sup> grades students in California.

### 5. Instructional Methods:

The primary instructional method utilized at Allen Elementary is the direct instruction teaching model. The phases of direct instruction allow students to practice the learning several times until mastery is achieved. Differentiation and small flexible groupings are also integral to the direct instruction model. Differentiation has become a way to bridge the gaps and give equal opportunities and access for all students. This enables teachers to meet with students on an individual level and in small groups on a daily basis. As Allen evolved into a school with increasingly diverse needs, it became clear that differentiation was essential to accommodate our general education, GATE, and fully-included students with special needs populations.

Another guiding principal of instruction at Allen is the faithful replication of the base programs and use of assessments to maintain consistency of the core curriculum. Each grade level collaborates on a weekly basis to analyze the testing data and identify the achievement gaps that need to be filled. Once those gaps are determined, differentiated student groups are formed by focusing on the standard-based skills that need to be developed. Teachers collaborate weekly and plan differentiated lessons, create supplements, share successful strategies, and meet in vertical teams (grades above and below) to understand the alignment of the standards at each grade level and the requirements for up-leveling and acceleration. Both teacher and student reflections are necessary to bring about awareness for personal goal setting based on the individual student needs.

Due to the large student population of ELL's, differentiated instruction also serves as a strong academic tool for these students to become proficient in English. Based on data provided by the California English Language Development Test (CEDLT), English Language Development (ELD) groups are formed and teachers utilize the Systematic English Language Development (SELD) instruction and ELL handbook from Houghton Mifflin to improve oral and written language skills. Once students are organized into their language groups, the students practiced their listening and speaking skills with other students who are at their level and received focused, meaningful instruction from the teacher.

The Direct Instruction model is based on continual checking for understanding and the gradual release of responsibility with an emphasis on student engagement, which is used to further determine how differentiated groups are formed. During independent practice, leveled groups give students the opportunity to work with teachers one-on-one or with a small group. At Allen, the teachers also create opportunities to participate in different enrichment activities such as independent studies, extension menus, hands-on learning, and the usage of manipulatives. Furthermore, the key tool Allen utilizes to support students in their varied group activities is *Thinking Maps*, a form of graphic organizer which uses a language of eight visual patterns each based on a fundamental thinking process. *Thinking Maps* are consistently used for students to display mastery of a concept or to show organizational skills. For example, our classrooms display our targeted groups for differentiated instruction with a variety of student work samples posted at all levels. These opportunities for learning improve students' confidence and make them eager to learn across the grade levels.

### 6. Professional Development:

The state standards and district goals are the underlying foundations for all professional development. A systemic professional development plan is in place on site and is based on District mandated trainings combined with on-site professional development initiated through informal and formal staff surveys and leadership team representatives. District trainings have included specialized training in working with Strategic and Benchmark students and differentiation of instruction. The district also encourages teachers be trained in strategies that include Specifically Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) Strategies, Standards Based Lesson Design, and Direct Instruction. At the site level, Allen has trained several staff members as *Thinking Map* coaches. They provide on-site training for staff members and support on a continuing basis. In addition, teachers may attend various after school workshops that cover various standards-based areas such as Academic Vocabulary, *Thinking Maps*, data analysis, and the integration of the arts and technology. These workshops are available on a monthly basis.

As one of the district-designated GATE schools, Allen Elementary teachers participate in both mandatory and optional GATE trainings. These trainings include monthly meetings, weekend conferences, summer institutes, and specialized day trainings. First year GATE teachers participate in Rookie Rap, a forum in which they can think and discuss their needs with one another and with the district GATE coordinator. Second year GATE teachers participate in Collegial Support, where they receive a release day and observe a GATE lesson in a veteran teacher's classroom and develop their own differentiated lesson plans.

The effectiveness of professional development is measured in a number of ways, including Action Walk visitations facilitated by administrators, GATE coordinator, Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSA's), and other veteran teachers. During these visitations, each group takes notes of the evidence from the classrooms, which is then utilized by staff to drive instruction and to determine future professional development. In addition, student work is continually evaluated for evidence of the effectiveness of professional development through teacher collaborations and teacher/administrator data talks. Furthermore, at the end of each workshop, teachers evaluate the presentation and are given the opportunity to respond to the value of the training and how the information presented will be implemented in the classroom. The success of our professional development is reflected by the continuing rise in the numbers of Allen students achieving the proficient and advanced levels on the CST.

### 7. School Leadership:

Leadership at Allen Elementary begins with the School Site Council, composed of parents, teachers, administrators and classified staff, and provides the opportunity for input from all stakeholders in our school community. The School Site Council has the primary responsibility for developing the Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA), a document that establishes and monitors specific goals for the school and approves the categorical budgets.

The SPSA becomes the guide utilized to focus the efforts of all stakeholders. The plan provides for interventions for at-risk students and professional development for teachers and staff. In addition, we have allocated resources to ensure that parents are an integral part of meeting our school goals by providing parent training programs, such as *The Ten Educational Commandments*, a program designed to help parents become involved in their child's education and inspire families with the value of a college education.

Allen Elementary utilizes a collaborative decision making model with the goal of creating the best environment possible for students. This ideal is espoused by the school Leadership Team, comprised of a teacher from each grade level. The grade-level representatives' duties include attending monthly Leadership Team meetings and district-sponsored Leadership Academies, creating and maintaining weekly collaboration agendas, and leading weekly collaboration meetings. The principal works with the Leadership Team to support the sharing of best practices, identifies student intervention needs, and allocates school resources to successfully meet school-wide goals. The principal's role at Allen is best described by a quote from Steven Sample, the former president of the University of Southern California, "Work for those who work for you; recruit the best lieutenants available, and spend most of your time and energy helping them to succeed." All the stakeholders at Allen are a community of leaders who share the same strong vision of excellence in student achievement. It's through the range of leadership opportunities provided at Allen that we all come together and move the vision forward.

# PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

# STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 2 Test: California Standards Tests Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2010 Publisher: Educational Testing Service

|  | 2009-2010   | 2008-2009   | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                              | May         | May         | May       | May       | May       |
| SCHOOL SCORES                              |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 89          | 84          | 84        | 88        | 92        |
| % Advanced                                 | 86          | 62          | 69        | 59        | 78        |
| Number of students tested                  | 71          | 85          | 72        | 78        | 64        |
| Percent of total students tested           | 100         | 100         | 100       | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  |             |             |           |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed |             |             |           |           |           |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                            |             |             |           |           |           |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ     | omic Disadv | antaged Stu | dents     |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 100         | 87          | 75        | 74        | 95        |
| % Advanced                                 | 100         | 70          | 60        | 52        | 84        |
| Number of students tested                  | 15          | 23          | 20        | 23        | 19        |
| 2. African American Students               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                 |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |             |             |           |           |           |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students             |             |             | <u> </u>  |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                 |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |             |             |           |           |           |
| 4. Special Education Students              |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                 |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |             |             |           |           |           |
| 5. English Language Learner Students       |             |             | <u> </u>  |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 96          | 88          | 79        | 84        | 97        |
| % Advanced                                 | 89          | 68          | 62        | 60        | 79        |
| Number of students tested                  | 46          | 50          | 47        | 42        | 33        |
| 6. Asian                                   |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 97          | 90          | 85        | 91        | 93        |
| % Advanced                                 | 90          | 67          | 71        | 68        | 81        |
| Number of students tested                  | 59          | 70          | 56        | 57        | 42        |
| NOTES:                                     |             |             |           |           |           |

Subject: Reading Grade: 2 Test: California Standards Tests Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2010 Publisher: Educational Testing Service

|  | 2009-2010   | 2008-2009   | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                              | May         | May         | May       | May       | May       |
| SCHOOL SCORES                              |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 84          | 86          | 85        | 76        | 84        |
| % Advanced                                 | 59          | 55          | 57        | 45        | 45        |
| Number of students tested                  | 71          | 85          | 72        | 78        | 64        |
| Percent of total students tested           | 100         | 100         | 100       | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  | 0           | 0           | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0           | 0           | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                            |             |             |           |           |           |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ     | omic Disadv | antaged Stu | dents     |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 94          | 92          | 65        | 69        | 84        |
| % Advanced                                 | 87          | 57          | 50        | 43        | 42        |
| Number of students tested                  | 15          | 23          | 20        | 23        | 19        |
| 2. African American Students               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                 |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |             |             |           |           |           |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students             |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                 |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |             |             |           |           |           |
| 4. Special Education Students              |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                 |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |             |             |           |           |           |
| 5. English Language Learner Students       |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 85          | 84          | 79        | 72        | 87        |
| % Advanced                                 | 61          | 54          | 47        | 48        | 45        |
| Number of students tested                  | 46          | 50          | 47        | 42        | 33        |
| 6. Asian                                   |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 88          | 90          | 86        | 84        | 88        |
| % Advanced                                 | 61          | 61          | 61        | 51        | 52        |
| Number of students tested                  | 59          | 70          | 56        | 57        | 42        |
| NOTES:                                     |             |             |           |           |           |

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 3 Test: California Standards Tests Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2010 Publisher: Educational Testing Service

|  | 2009-2010   | 2008-2009   | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                              | May         | May         | May       | May       | May       |
| SCHOOL SCORES                              |             |             | ·         |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 94          | 88          | 91        | 94        | 91        |
| % Advanced                                 | 85          | 80          | 74        | 74        | 76        |
| Number of students tested                  | 100         | 87          | 89        | 80        | 75        |
| Percent of total students tested           | 100         | 98          | 100       | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  |             | 2           |           |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed |             | 2           |           |           |           |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                            |             |             |           |           |           |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ     | omic Disadv | antaged Stu | dents     |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 96          | 75          | 88        | 93        | 100       |
| % Advanced                                 | 89          | 71          | 71        | 63        | 92        |
| Number of students tested                  | 27          | 28          | 24        | 27        | 13        |
| 2. African American Students               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                 |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |             |             |           |           |           |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students             |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 90          |             |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                 | 70          |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  | 10          |             |           |           |           |
| 4. Special Education Students              |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                 |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |             |             |           |           |           |
| 5. English Language Learner Students       |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 91          | 83          | 72        | 88        | 87        |
| % Advanced                                 | 75          | 76          | 50        | 63        | 56        |
| Number of students tested                  | 32          | 55          | 18        | 24        | 16        |
| 6. Asian                                   |             |             |           |           | -         |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 99          | 92          | 91        | 95        | 88        |
| % Advanced                                 | 90          | 86          | 77        | 80        | 74        |
| Number of students tested                  | 80          | 69          | 70        | 59        | 50        |
| NOTES:                                     |             |             |           |           |           |

Subject: Reading Grade: 3 Test: California Standards Tests Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2010 Publisher: Educational Testing Service

| isadvanta | 79 46 87 97 2 2 2 aged Stud 68 43 28                   | May  | 75 39 80 100 0 0 74 37 27             | May   |
|-----------|--|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| isadvanta | 46<br>87<br>97<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>aged Stud<br>68<br>43 | 43<br>89<br>100<br>0<br>0<br>dents<br>71<br>29 | 39<br>80<br>100<br>0<br>0<br>74<br>37 | 43<br>75<br>100<br>0<br>0<br>85<br>31               |
| isadvanta | 46<br>87<br>97<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>aged Stud<br>68<br>43 | 43<br>89<br>100<br>0<br>0<br>dents<br>71<br>29 | 39<br>80<br>100<br>0<br>0<br>74<br>37 | 43<br>75<br>100<br>0<br>0<br>85<br>31               |
| isadvanta | 87<br>97<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>aged Stud<br>68<br>43       | 89<br>100<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>dents<br>71<br>29  | 80<br>100<br>0<br>0<br>74<br>37       | 75<br>100<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>85<br>31                |
| isadvanta | 97<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>aged Stud<br>68<br>43             | 100<br>0<br>0<br>dents<br>71<br>29             | 100<br>0<br>0<br>74<br>37             | 100<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>85<br>31                      |
| isadvanta | 2<br>2<br>aged Stud<br>68<br>43                        | 0<br>0<br>0<br>dents<br>71<br>29               | 74<br>37                              | 85<br>31  |
|           | 2<br>aged Stud<br>68<br>43                             | 0 dents 71 29                                  | 74 37                                 | 85<br>31  |
|           | aged Stud<br>68<br>43                                  | 71<br>29                                       | 74 37                                 | 85<br>31  |
|           | 68   | 71 29  | 37                                    | 31  |
|           | 68   | 71 29  | 37                                    | 31  |
|           | 43   | 29   | 37                                    | 31  |
|           |  |  |                                       |   |
|           | 28   | 24   | 27                                    | 13  |
|           |  |  |                                       |   |
|           |  |  |                                       |   |
|           |  |  |                                       |   |
|           |  |  |                                       |   |
|           |  |  |                                       |   |
|           |  |  |                                       |   |
|           |  |  |                                       |   |
|           |  |  |                                       |   |
|           |  |  |                                       |   |
|           |  |  |                                       |   |
|           |  |  |                                       |   |
|           |  |  |                                       |   |
|           |  |  |                                       |   |
|           |  |  |                                       |   |
|           | 75   | 40   | 54                                    | 50  |
|           | 42   | 13   | 8                                     | 19  |
|           | 55   | 15   | 24                                    | 16  |
|           |  |  |                                       |   |
|           | 86   | 77   | 78                                    | 72  |
|           |  |  | 44                                    | 44  |
|           | 51   | 50   | 17                                    |   |
|           |  | 55   | 2     55     15       6     86     77 | 2     55     15     24       3     86     77     78 |

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 4 Test: California Standards Tests Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2010 Publisher: Educational Testing Service

|  | 2009-2010   | 2008-2009   | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                              | May         | May         | May       | May       | May       |
| SCHOOL SCORES                              |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 97          | 98          | 100       | 99        | 93        |
| % Advanced                                 | 90          | 93          | 95        | 93        | 82        |
| Number of students tested                  | 114         | 122         | 104       | 120       | 107       |
| Percent of total students tested           | 98          | 98          | 100       | 100       | 98        |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  | 2           | 2           |           |           | 2         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 2           | 2           |           |           | 2         |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                            |             |             |           | <u> </u>  |           |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ     | omic Disadv | antaged Stu | dents     |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 97          | 98          | 100       | 98        | 95        |
| % Advanced                                 | 89          | 89          | 100       | 86        | 90        |
| Number of students tested                  | 37          | 44          | 35        | 42        | 42        |
| 2. African American Students               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                 |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |             |             |           |           |           |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students             |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 92          | 100         | 100       | 96        |           |
| % Advanced                                 | 50          | 100         | 92        | 87        |           |
| Number of students tested                  | 12          | 14          | 13        | 23        |           |
| 4. Special Education Students              |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                 |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |             |             |           |           |           |
| 5. English Language Learner Students       |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 92          | 95          | 100       | 94        | 86        |
| % Advanced                                 | 72          | 84          | 81        | 83        | 57        |
| Number of students tested                  | 25          | 19          | 16        | 18        | 21        |
| 6. Asian                                   |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 99          | 97          | 100       | 100       | 96        |
| % Advanced                                 | 95          | 94          | 96        | 93        | 87        |
| Number of students tested                  | 92          | 90          | 75        | 76        | 82        |
| NOTES:                                     |             |             |           |           |           |

Subject: Reading Grade: 4 Test: California Standards Tests Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2010 Publisher: Educational Testing Service

|  | 2009-2010   | 2008-2009   | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                              | May         | May         | May       | May       | May       |
| SCHOOL SCORES                              |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 90          | 95          | 96        | 93        | 84        |
| % Advanced                                 | 77          | 83          | 86        | 80        | 64        |
| Number of students tested                  | 114         | 121         | 104       | 120       | 107       |
| Percent of total students tested           | 98          | 99          | 100       | 100       | 98        |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  | 2           | 1           |           |           | 2         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 2           | 1           |           |           | 2         |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                            |             |             |           |           |           |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ     | omic Disadv | antaged Stu | dents     |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 83          | 95          | 97        | 88        | 88        |
| % Advanced                                 | 78          | 86          | 94        | 71        | 71        |
| Number of students tested                  | 37          | 44          | 35        | 42        | 42        |
| 2. African American Students               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                 |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |             |             |           |           |           |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students             |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 63          | 93          | 92        | 95        |           |
| % Advanced                                 | 45          | 86          | 92        | 78        |           |
| Number of students tested                  | 11          | 14          | 13        | 23        |           |
| 4. Special Education Students              |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                 |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |             |             |           |           |           |
| 5. English Language Learner Students       |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 64          | 84          | 81        | 61        | 48        |
| % Advanced                                 | 48          | 47          | 50        | 50        | 19        |
| Number of students tested                  | 25          | 19          | 16        | 17        | 21        |
| 6. Asian                                   |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 94          | 98          | 96        | 91        | 82        |
| % Advanced                                 | 83          | 86          | 88        | 80        | 66        |
| Number of students tested                  | 92          | 90          | 75        | 76        | 82        |
| NOTES:                                     |             |             |           |           |           |

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 5 Test: California Standards Tests Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2010 Publisher: Educational Testing Service

|  | 2009-2010   | 2008-2009   | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                              | May         | May         | May       | May       | May       |
| SCHOOL SCORES                              |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 97          | 97          | 95        | 90        | 95        |
| % Advanced                                 | 78          | 70          | 69        | 70        | 79        |
| Number of students tested                  | 136         | 120         | 133       | 128       | 111       |
| Percent of total students tested           | 98          | 99          | 100       | 98        | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  | 2           |             |           | 2         |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 2           |             |           | 2         |           |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                            |             | <u>-</u>    | <u>-</u>  |           |           |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ     | omic Disadv | antaged Stu | dents     |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 95          | 98          | 96        | 97        | 96        |
| % Advanced                                 | 83          | 69          | 69        | 74        | 78        |
| Number of students tested                  | 41          | 55          | 49        | 47        | 50        |
| 2. African American Students               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                 |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |             |             |           |           |           |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students             |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 100         | 94          | 97        | 100       | 91        |
| % Advanced                                 | 82          | 38          | 69        | 71        | 82        |
| Number of students tested                  | 17          | 16          | 29        | 14        | 11        |
| 4. Special Education Students              |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               |             | 84          |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                 |             | 69          |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |             | 13          |           |           |           |
| 5. English Language Learner Students       |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 91          | 87          | 83        | 54        | 83        |
| % Advanced                                 | 55          | 47          | 44        | 23        | 33        |
| Number of students tested                  | 22          | 15          | 18        | 13        | 12        |
| 6. Asian                                   |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 99          | 97          | 97        | 90        | 95        |
| % Advanced                                 | 80          | 79          | 72        | 72        | 81        |
| Number of students tested                  | 104         | 87          | 85        | 98        | 85        |
| NOTES:                                     |             |             |           |           |           |

Subject: Reading Grade: 5 Test: California Standards Tests Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2010 Publisher: Educational Testing Service

|  | 2009-2010   | 2008-2009   | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                              | May         | May         | May       | May       | May       |
| SCHOOL SCORES                              |             | ·           | ·         |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 93          | 94          | 90        | 87        | 89        |
| % Advanced                                 | 73          | 68          | 58        | 57        | 66        |
| Number of students tested                  | 137         | 121         | 133       | 128       | 111       |
| Percent of total students tested           | 99          | 100         | 100       | 98        | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  | 1           |             |           | 2         |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 1           |             |           | 2         |           |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                            |             |             |           |           |           |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ     | omic Disadv | antaged Stu | dents     |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 90          | 96          | 81        | 92        | 90        |
| % Advanced                                 | 73          | 65          | 63        | 62        | 66        |
| Number of students tested                  | 41          | 55          | 49        | 47        | 50        |
| 2. African American Students               |             | <u> </u>    | <u> </u>  |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                 |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |             |             |           |           |           |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students             |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 94          | 94          | 89        | 100       | 82        |
| % Advanced                                 | 76          | 44          | 55        | 71        | 73        |
| Number of students tested                  | 17          | 16          | 29        | 14        | 11        |
| 4. Special Education Students              |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               |             | 61          |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                 |             | 38          |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |             | 13          |           |           |           |
| 5. English Language Learner Students       |             | <u> </u>    | <u> </u>  |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 77          | 80          | 61        | 30        | 34        |
| % Advanced                                 | 41          | 33          | 17        | 15        | 17        |
| Number of students tested                  | 22          | 15          | 18        | 13        | 12        |
| 6. Asian                                   |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 94          | 95          | 89        | 86        | 88        |
| % Advanced                                 | 76          | 75          | 55        | 58        | 67        |
| Number of students tested                  | 104         | 88          | 85        | 98        | 85        |
| NOTES:                                     |             |             |           |           |           |

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 6 Test: California Standards Tests Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2010 Publisher: Educational Testing Service

|  | 2009-2010   | 2008-2009   | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                              | May         | May         | May       | May       | May       |
| SCHOOL SCORES                              |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 95          | 93          | 92        | 91        | 88        |
| % Advanced                                 | 74          | 75          | 70        | 67        | 70        |
| Number of students tested                  | 128         | 133         | 127       | 123       | 132       |
| Percent of total students tested           | 100         | 100         | 98        | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  |             |             | 2         |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed |             |             | 2         |           |           |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                            |             |             |           | <u> </u>  |           |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ     | omic Disadv | antaged Stu | dents     |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 96          | 95          | 96        | 90        | 74        |
| % Advanced                                 | 71          | 82          | 81        | 62        | 58        |
| Number of students tested                  | 51          | 45          | 53        | 58        | 43        |
| 2. African American Students               |             |             |           | <u> </u>  |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                 |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |             |             |           |           |           |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students             |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 100         | 100         | 95        | 91        | 48        |
| % Advanced                                 | 47          | 80          | 63        | 50        | 32        |
| Number of students tested                  | 17          | 30          | 19        | 22        | 19        |
| 4. Special Education Students              |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 80          |             |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                 | 60          |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  | 10          |             |           |           |           |
| 5. English Language Learner Students       |             |             |           | <u> </u>  |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 63          | 72          | 59        |           | 30        |
| % Advanced                                 | 8           | 36          | 17        |           | 15        |
| Number of students tested                  | 11          | 14          | 12        |           | 13        |
| 6. Asian                                   |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 94          | 94          | 93        | 92        | 100       |
| % Advanced                                 | 81          | 75          | 74        | 73        | 84        |
| Number of students tested                  | 90          | 85          | 97        | 91        | 92        |
| NOTES:                                     |             |             |           |           |           |

Subject: Reading Grade: 6 Test: California Standards Tests Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2010 Publisher: Educational Testing Service

|  | 2009-2010   | 2008-2009   | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                              | May         | May         | May       | May       | May       |
| SCHOOL SCORES                              |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 94          | 93          | 91        | 90        | 88        |
| % Advanced                                 | 73          | 75          | 69        | 63        | 69        |
| Number of students tested                  | 127         | 132         | 127       | 123       | 132       |
| Percent of total students tested           | 99          | 99          | 98        | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  | 1           | 1           | 2         |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 1           | 1           | 2         |           |           |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                            |             |             |           |           |           |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ     | omic Disadv | antaged Stu | dents     |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 95          | 96          | 94        | 87        | 74        |
| % Advanced                                 | 71          | 69          | 75        | 53        | 60        |
| Number of students tested                  | 51          | 45          | 53        | 58        | 43        |
| 2. African American Students               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                 |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |             |             |           |           |           |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students             |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 94          | 97          | 95        | 87        | 47        |
| % Advanced                                 | 47          | 60          | 74        | 55        | 21        |
| Number of students tested                  | 17          | 30          | 19        | 22        | 19        |
| 4. Special Education Students              |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                 |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |             |             |           |           |           |
| 5. English Language Learner Students       |             |             | <u> </u>  |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 90          | 69          | 42        |           | 23        |
| % Advanced                                 | 10          | 31          | 17        |           | 0         |
| Number of students tested                  | 10          | 13          | 12        |           | 13        |
| 6. Asian                                   |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 93          | 95          | 90        | 90        | 99        |
| % Advanced                                 | 80          | 74          | 71        | 66        | 82        |
| Number of students tested                  | 89          | 84          | 97        | 91        | 92        |
| NOTES:                                     |             |             |           |           |           |

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 0

|  | 2009-2010   | 2008-2009   | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2000 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                              | May         | May         | May       | May       | May       |
| SCHOOL SCORES                              |             |             | <u>-</u>  |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 96          | 93          | 94        | 93        | 93        |
| % Advanced                                 | 82          | 77          | 75        | 73        | 77        |
| Number of students tested                  | 553         | 549         | 527       | 531       | 491       |
| Percent of total students tested           | 100         | 100         | 100       | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  |             |             |           |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed |             |             |           |           |           |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                            |             |             |           |           |           |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ     | omic Disadv | antaged Stu | dents     |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 97          | 94          | 94        | 94        | 91        |
| % Advanced                                 | 79          | 77          | 77        | 69        | 77        |
| Number of students tested                  | 173         | 197         | 181       | 197       | 167       |
| 2. African American Students               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                 |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |             |             |           |           |           |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students             |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 97          | 90          | 94        | 93        | 77        |
| % Advanced                                 | 61          | 66          | 68        | 64        | 60        |
| Number of students tested                  | 58          | 73          | 74        | 75        | 52        |
| 4. Special Education Students              |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 88          | 93          | 90        | 81        | 80        |
| % Advanced                                 | 82          | 0           | 0         | 0         | 52        |
| Number of students tested                  | 44          | 43          | 42        | 42        | 31        |
| 5. English Language Learner Students       |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 94          | 93          | 93        | 94        | 94        |
| % Advanced                                 | 70          | 66          | 55        | 55        | 56        |
| Number of students tested                  | 236         | 286         | 276       | 319       | 284       |
| 6. Asian                                   |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 98          | 95          | 95        | 94        | 96        |
| % Advanced                                 | 87          | 81          | 78        | 77        | 82        |
|  |             |             |           |           |           |

Subject: Reading Grade: 0

|  | 2009-2010   | 2008-2009   | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                              | May         | May         | May       | May       | May       |
| SCHOOL SCORES                              |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 90          | 91          | 88        | 86        | 86        |
| % Advanced                                 | 67          | 66          | 63        | 59        | 60        |
| Number of students tested                  | 553         | 550         | 527       | 531       | 491       |
| Percent of total students tested           | 100         | 100         | 100       | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  |             |             |           |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed |             |             |           |           |           |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                            |             |             |           |           |           |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ     | omic Disadv | antaged Stu | dents     |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 90          | 92          | 86        | 87        | 86        |
| % Advanced                                 | 69          | 67          | 66        | 56        | 60        |
| Number of students tested                  | 173         | 197         | 181       | 197       | 167       |
| 2. African American Students               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Advanced                                 |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |             |             |           |           |           |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students             |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 83          | 86          | 87        | 85        | 73        |
| % Advanced                                 | 51          | 51          | 58        | 55        | 43        |
| Number of students tested                  | 58          | 73          | 74        | 75        | 52        |
| 4. Special Education Students              |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 74          | 76          | 61        | 50        | 57        |
| % Advanced                                 | 67          | 0           | 0         | 0         | 26        |
| Number of students tested                  | 44          | 43          | 42        | 42        | 31        |
| 5. English Language Learner Students       |             |             |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 84          | 90          | 86        | 86        | 86        |
| % Advanced                                 | 43          | 43          | 34        | 33        | 26        |
| Number of students tested                  | 236         | 286         | 276       | 319       | 284       |
| 6. Asian                                   |             |             | <u> </u>  |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced               | 91          | 94          | 89        | 87        | 88        |
| % Advanced                                 | 72          | 71          | 66        | 61        | 66        |
| Number of students tested                  | 428         | 405         | 383       | 381       | 351       |
| NOTES:                                     |             |             |           |           |           |